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Introduction

In compiling the New World catalogue of Laniatores (Kury 2003a), from hereafter referred to as KC, the author inadvertently did not always strictly observe the ICZN rules. This applies specially to Article 13.3 which deals with the availability of generic names proposed without original designation of a type species after 1930. Likewise, a thorough search for homonyms has not been done, resulting in that a number of homonyms went undetected, and in some cases those homonyms brought broader consequences to the nomenclature. Also conflicting publication dates of some papers were cited in KC either wrongly or correctly, but in divergence with Neave’s Nomenclator Zoologicus (abbreviated here as NN) or Zoological Record’s (abbreviated here as ZR) citations, in a few cases affecting priority. After a meticulous search in libraries and consulting the publishers, correct dates of publication for relevant works are given here in the References section. Also, some formatting errors crept in and are here indicated.

This paper, therefore, provides amendments to inconsistencies, mistakes and omissions in KC. Page numbers in the text refer to KC.

In the same year of issue of KC a few new publications appeared on American Laniatores (González-Sponga 2003a-b; Kury 2003b; Mendes & Kury 2003; Pérez-González & Vasconcelos 2003; Pinto-da-Rocha & Kury 2003). As far as we know, only two relevant publications up to 2002 are not in the references of KC (Firmo & Pinto-da-Rocha 2002 and Soares & Avram, 1987).

Due to the great delay in preparing this work, while we were checking for pending data, a number of homonyms has been recently noted and corrected by Özdikmen (2006; 2008); Özdikmen & Kury (2006); Özdikmen & Demir (2008) and Villarreal & Kury (2009). Likewise two important corrections originally intended to be here, appeared elsewhere first due to some pressing demands – the precedence of Triaenonychoidea over Travunioidea (Kury & Mendes 2007) and a correction from Minuidae to Kimulidae (Pérez-González & Kury 2007).

In the references section, precise dates of issue (as much as we could determine) are given in brackets where relevant. Between 2004 and 2009 a number of systematic works appeared on American Laniatores, which are listed in the Appendix 1. Names of authors of genera/species are given, except when the text is a quote of Kury (2003a).

Results

P. 15: *Erebomaster acanthina* (Crosby and Bishop, 1924) should be corrected to *Erebomaster acanthinus* (Crosby and Bishop, 1924) and *Erebomaster flavescens coecum* (Packard, 1888) to *Erebomaster flavescens coecus* (Packard, 1888).

Remarks. Genera ending in –*master* (from Greek, “one who seeks”) are masculine.

P. 16: *Theromaster brunnea* (Banks, 1902) should be replaced by *Theromaster brunneus* (Banks, 1902).

Remarks. Genera ending in –*master* (from Greek, “one who seeks”) are masculine.

P. 23: *Brotasus* Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC *contra* correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of *Brotasus* (and of *B. megalobunus*) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 24: *Contuor* Roewer, 1963 is of neuter gender.

Remarks. There is no etymology in the original description. In Latin, this is a verb (“I watch”) and, consequently, could not be available according to Art. 11.8. Since no etymology is given, it can be left as a combination of letters with no meaning (Art. 30.1.4.1.), and neuter according to its original combination with the specific epithet *novum*.

P. 24: *Jimeneziella* Avram, 1970 is an unavailable name, lacking an original type species designation (Art. 13.3.), obligatory for any genus to become available after 1930. With the former Code, the author should have been Kury, 2003, because this author gave a reference to a description and designated a type species. But with the 4th Edition of the Code, he fails to fulfil the requirements of Art. 16.1. Thence, this genus is still unavailable and must be described as a new genus, as follows:
Jimeneziella Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga, new genus


P. 25: Limonia González-Sponga, 1998 (non Meigen, 1803, Diptera; nec Agassiz, 1846; nec Carvalho, 1985, Hemiptera) should be replaced by Manuelangelia Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga, nom. nov. Gender feminine. With González-Sponga’s permission (pers. comm., 2004). The generic name is based on González-Sponga’s prename and middle name.

Remarks. This genus is a homonym and must be replaced. The type species is combined as Manuelangelia tuberosa (González-Sponga, 1998) comb. nov.

P. 27: Pseudomitraceras Roewer, 1912 is neuter. Consequently specific names should be inflected: Pseudomitraceras brasiliense Roewer, 1912, Pseudomitraceras curvatum Goodnight & Goodnight, 1942a and Pseudomitraceras minutum Goodnight & Goodnight, 1942b.

Remarks. Genera ending in –ceras: this is Greek for “horn” and is neuter (see examples of Art. 30.1.2 of ICZN).

P. 28: Spinolatum Goodnight & Goodnight, 1942a seems to be Latin, unless the authors had stated the contrary. As they did not, gender should in this case be neuter, according to Art. 30.1.3. Consequently, the species should be Spinolatum mediale Goodnight & Goodnight, 1942a.

P. 30: The name Angeliniae González-Sponga, 1987 [corrected or not to Angeliniae] is permanently invalid, because the type genus, Angela González-Sponga, 1987 is a junior homonym (Art. 39).

P. 30: Barlovento González-Sponga, 1987 is masculine by application of Art. 30.2.1, being a masculine Spanish word. Consequently, Barlovento marmoratus (González-Sponga, 1981). Note that Barlovento albapatella González-Sponga, 1987 does not change, its specific epithet being a substantive in apposition.

P. 31: Angela González-Sponga, 1987: add also “(nec Lesson, 1843, Coelenterata)”.

P. 32: Phalangozea Muñoz-Cuevas is wrongly dated as of 1975 in KC contra correctly 1976.

P. 34: Zamora Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of Zamora (and of Z. granulata Roewer) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 35: Bidoma Šilhavý 1973, seemingly a Latin word consisting of bi- “two” and doma “roof”, is neuter (unless Šilhavý had given another etymology, which he did not). Consequently, Bidoma indivisum Šilhavý 1973.

P. 38: The following species should be added before Arucillus hispaniolicus:

Arucillus armasi Pérez-González & Vasconcelos, 2003

Arucillus armasi Pérez-González & Vasconcelos, 2003: 135, figs 1–16 (types CZACC 3.2809, ♂ holotype; CZACC and MNRJ paratypes).

Type locality. REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA. LA VEGA. La Nevera, Valle Nuevo, Constanza.

P. 39: Cocholla Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of Cocholla (and of C. simoni Roewer) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 39: Cosmetellus Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of Cosmetellus (and of C. columnaris Roewer) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.
Cynorta v-flava González-Sponga, 1992 must be converted into Cynorta v-flavum, since gender of alphabet letters in Latin is neuter, and flavum must refer to the part of the name before it.

This is a setting mistake: Cynortellina lineata Roewer, 1915 should be bold and separate, as a species.

Cynortoides Roewer, 1912 is feminine, as treated originally by its author (Art. 30.1.4.4). Consequently, Cynortoides albiadspersa Goodnight & Goodnight, C. caralibica (Sørensen), C. cubana cubana (Banks), C. cubana signata Roewer, C. marginata Goodnight & Goodnight and C. quadrispinosa Goodnight & Goodnight.

Denticynorta denticus (Walker, 1928): Roewer’s declension of denticus, a word looking like Latin, but not in any Latin dictionary, must be taken as an incorrect emendation, unless Walker stated it was an adjective or gave its etymology for us to decide. If not, it should be Denticynorta denticus. Although the name is obviously derived from dens = tooth, as a possible truncation of “denticulus”, Latin rules do not apply.

Eucynortoides Roewer, 1912 is feminine, as treated originally by its author (ICZN Art. 30.1.4.4). Consequently, E. maculata Roewer and E. parvula (Banks).

Metacynortoides Roewer, 1912 is feminine, as treated originally by its author (Art. 30.1.4.4). Consequently, M. bilineata Goodnight & Goodnight, M. obscura obscura (Banks), M. obscura dorsalis Roewer, M. romana Goodnight & Goodnight and M. scabrosa (Banks).

Metavononoides Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of Metavononoides is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

The synonymy regarding Zaraxolia should be changed as follows: Zaraxolia Roewer, 1947: 27 (type species Zarax aenescens Sørensen, 1932 by original designation) [= Paeci-laema: Goodnight & Goodnight, 1953b] synonymy established by González-Sponga, 1992.

Remarks. Zarax Sørensen, 1932, was described without a type species. Thence, it is unavailable (Art. 13.3). Moreover it is a homonym (non Pascoe, 1867, Coleoptera).

Mello-Leitão (1933c: 111, 114) separated one of the original species in Zarax to be probably a Neocynorta, and described an available genus Zarax with type species by monotypy Zarax devians Sørensen, 1932 by monotypy. This genus is invalid because of homonymy as well.

However, Strand proposed in 1942 the genus Zaraxolia as a replacement name for Zarax of Sørensen (mentioning Mello-Leitão as well). So, Zaraxolia Strand, 1942 is available as a replacement name for Zarax Mello-Leitão, 1933c: 114. Its type species is the same as for the latter genus, and not Z. aenescens Sørensen, 1932, as mentioned in KC, following Roewer (1947).

In 1947, Roewer (p. 27) designated Z. aenescens Sørensen, 1932 as type species of Zaraxolia Strand, missing the fact that this genus already had another type species, so this designation is invalid, this not being the creation of a new genus. On p. 32, he proposed the new genus Zaraxes with type species Zaraxes devians Sørensen, 1932, already the type species of Zarax Mello-Leitão, 1933 and its replacement name Zaraxolia Strand, 1942.

So the real synonymies for the genera involved are:

Neocynorta Roewer, 1915
   = Neocynorta Roewer, 1915b: 120. Type species by monotypy: Neocynorta virescens Roewer, 1915.
   = Zarax Sørensen, 1932 [part: Zarax aenescens]. Unavailable.

Messa Sørensen, 1932 is unavailable, because it had originally no type species designated. Consequently the genus Messa must be adscribed to Mello-Leitão, 1933c, who was the first to provide a type species designation (Libitia (Messa) scalaris Sørensen, 1932) and a description (plus a reference to the original, unavailable description by Sørensen), fulfilling thus the requirements of Art. 13.1 and 13.3 of the Code. Messatana must stand (since Mello-Leitão’s name is still a homonym of Messa Leach, 1817 [Hymenoptera]) even if Strand mentioned Sørensen as author, since the author’s name is not a part of the scientific name (although this peculiarity should be quoted).
**Zaraxolia** Strand, 1942

= Zarax Sørensen, 1932 [part: Zarax devians]. Unavailable.

= Zarax Mello-Leitão, 1933c: 114 (non Pascoe, 1867, Coleoptera, nec Fruhstorfer, 1914, Lepidoptera). Type species by monotypy: *Zarax devians* Sørensen, 1932. Invalid, homonym.


= Zaraxes Roewer, 1947: 32. Type species by original designation: *Zarax devians* Sørensen, 1932. Invalid, objective synonym.

P. 74: *Paecilaema* Koch, 1839 is correctly used as the right spelling in KC. NN wrongly mentions that *Paecilaema* Koch, 1839b *Uebers. Arachnidens.*, 2: 11 (published December), is a lapsus for *Paecilima* Koch, 1839a *Die Arachniden*, 7(5): 104 (published July), which must have priority. If this statement were correct, all species names would have to be constructed with *Paecilima* as the valid generic name. Actually Koch (1839a), used both the forms *Paecilima* (p. 104) and *Paecilaema* (p. 107). Therefore, *Paecilaema* as used in Koch (1839b), is a fixation of the correct spelling by action of the first reviser.

*Paecilaema* (or *Paecilima*) is neuter, the inflection in gender should be corrected with the species in: *P. acuriguense* González-Spong, *P. amazonicum* González-Spong, *P. campoeliasense* González-Spong, *P. eypum* (Chamberlin) (from the latinized Greek adjective *eutypós* “that can be shaped”), *P. festivum* Kury, *P. laterale* Goodnight & Goodnight and *P. oblongum* González-Spong. The name *P. albantica* (Roewer) is doubtful, because it is not a Latin orthodox word, but that could be an adjective.

P. 80: *Paecilaemana* Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of *Paecilaemana* (and of *P. cruz* Roewer and *P. halonata* Roewer) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 81: *Platymessa h-inscriptum* Mello-Leitão, 1941, since letters are neuter in Latin, and the adjective must refer to the letter, not to the genus.

P. 82: *Prasiana* Strand, 1942. The synonymy should be corrected as follows:


*Prasia* Mello-Leitão, 1933c: 113 (non Stål 1863). Type species *Cynorta* (*Prasia*) *fallax* Sørensen, 1932 by original designation. Invalid: junior homonym.

*Prasiana* Strand, 1942: 399. Replacement name. Isotypic.

Remarks. The subgenus *Prasia* included originally six species, without a designation of a type species, so the name is unavailable. When Mello-Leitão (1933c) elevated it to genus, he designated a type species, therefore erecting a new nominal genus. The homonymy was noted and corrected by Strand (1942), who mentioned mistakenly Sørensen as author of the genus.

P. 82: *Pararhauculus* Mello-Leitão is dated as of 1939 in KC contra 1940 in NN and ZR. Issue date is unknown, nominal date is 1939.

P. 83: *Rhauculanus* Roewer and *Rhauculus* Roewer are correctly dated as of 1928 in NN contra 1927 in KC. Correct publication date of *Rhauculanus* and *Rhauculus* (and of *Rhauculanus lineolatus* Roewer and of *Rhauculus insignitus* Roewer) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 84: *Vononana* Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of *Vononana* (and of the combination *Vononana peruviana*) is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 86: *Zaraxes* Roewer, 1947 is not the valid name for this genus, see discussion above under *Neocynorta*. The valid name is *Zaraxolia* Strand, 1942. Consequently, the valid combination for the species is *Zaraxolia devians* (Sørensen, 1932) comb. nov.

P. 86: Discosominae Pickard-Cambridge, 1904 (correctly it should have been spelled Discosomatinae) is permanently invalid because its type genus is a homonym (Art. 39).
P. 89: *Tetracyphus* Sørensen, 1932 is invalid because of homonymy: non Chevrolat, 1881, Coleoptera.

P. 90: *Angistrisoma* Roewer, 1932 was described without a type species designation and, thence, it is unavailable (Art. 13.3). Consequently:

*Angistrisoma* Soares & Soares, 1948b: 587 **bon. gen.** Type species by original designation: *Angistrisoma fuscum* Roewer, 1932.


Gender of this genus is neuter. Consequently: *A. atroluteum* Roewer and *A. fuscum* Roewer.

P. 90: *Aucayacuella* Avram, 1983 [or, possibly, Avram & Soares, 1983] can have only one type species, not two as in KC. The designation associated with the oldest description of the genus is the valid one. However, it is not possible for now to firmly establish the precise publication dates of both papers. Avram (1983) has the nominal date April 1983, but the real date should be a few months later (O. Villarreal, pers. comm. 2009), while Avram & Soares (1983) is only dated “1983”, which makes the conventional date to be December 31st. NN (*contra* Avram, 1987) gave priority to *Aucayacuella*, 1983 over *Aucayacuella*. We here assume the opposite. Because in the second paper it is said it is a new genus, we have two genera which are homonyms, and, at the same time, synonyms. The type species should be treated accordingly. A summary of the contents of the two competing descriptions is:


So, the interpretation should be:

*Aucayacuella* Avram, 1983


*Aucayacuella bordoni* Avram, 1983


P. 97: The spelling *Quidina* was treated as a different genus from *Quindina* in NN (1939). However, NN quoted *Quidina* as being the only original spelling (but with incorrect date 1915 *contra* 1914 in KC), and recorded *Quindina* Roewer 1923 as being an emendation of the spelling. However, Roewer (1923, p. 564) used as valid the spelling *Quindina* and mentioned “*Quidina* Roewer 1914 (err.)” acting thus as First Reviser (Art. 24.2).

P. 104: *Ampycella* Roewer, 1929 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 256), although below (pp. 152 and 282) it is listed under Ampycinae. This happened because the author originally intended a larger concept of Ampycinae and then, in the last minute, swayed by criticism, adopted a more cautious view, including a number of would-be ampycines in incertae sedis instead but leaving the lists unchanged. *Ampycella* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 104: *Glysterus* Roewer, 1931 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 256), although below (pp. 120, 152 and 291 ff.) it is listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Glysterus* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 105: *Hernandarioides* is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also pp. 140, 258), although below (p. 292) they are listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Hernandarioides* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 105: *Hernandria*. After a recheck of the original description, it is evident that Banks did not mean the description of a new genus, but only of a new species in the genus *Hernandaria* Sørensen, 1884, and he misspelled the generic name. Consequently, *Hernandria* is unavailable and must be placed as an “incorrect subsequent spelling” of *Hernandaria*. Banks had the habit of describing new genera with the appropriate qualification, there is no reason to consider this as a valid description. However, NN gives it mistakenly as a valid genus. The valid genus name is *Parahernandria* Goodnight & Goodnight, 1947c: 14, and the species included in it are *Parahernandria spinosa* (Banks, 1909), *comb. nov.* and *P. ventralis* (Banks, 1914) restored combination.

P. 105: *Hernandria/Parahernandria* Goodnight & Goodnight are incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 256), although below (pp. 120, 291) they are listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Parahernandria* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 105: *Hutamaia* Soares & Soares, 1977 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis”, although below (pp. 152, 258, 268, 285) it is listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Hutamaia* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 105: *Neopachyloides* Roewer, 1913 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 259), although below (pp. 152, 153, 274, 281, 285) it is listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Neopachyloides* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 105: *Nesopachylus* Chamberlin, 1925 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 259), although below (pp. 152, 292) it is listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Nesopachylus* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 106: *Sibollus* Roewer, 1929 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 260), although below (pp. 153, 285) it is listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Sibollus* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 106: *Thaumatopachylus* Roewer, 1929 is incongruously listed under “Gonyleptidae incertae sedis” (also p. 261), although below (pp. 153) it is listed under Ampycinae. See remarks above on *Ampycella*. *Thaumatopachylus* should be included in the Ampycinae.

P. 108: *Cnemoleptes* Mello-Leitão 1941: Add as a synonym:

*Cnemoleptus*: Neave, 1942: 55 (incorrect subsequent spelling).

P. 113: *Pristocnemis* Koch, [Dec.] 1839 is wrongly chosen over *Pristocnemus* Koch, [July] 1839 in KC. Koch initially created *Pristocnemus* (1839a) and later changed the spelling to *Pristocnemis* (1839b), supposedly more euphonic or more correct, but nevertheless only a subsequent incorrect spelling.

P. 120: *Huasampilia* Roewer, 1913 should be *Huasampilia*. The index in KC (p. 321) contains both forms.

P. 121: *Nemoribalta* Mello-Leitão, 1926: 352, is not a *nomen nudum* since there is a description in a key. However, there is no species mentioned, the first being *N. incerta* Mello-Leitão, 1927 (in Mello-Leitão, 1927: 19), which becomes the type species by subsequent designation.
P. 123: Currala Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in KC contra wrongly 1928 in NN. The cover of the fascicule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here as issue date.

P. 123: Deltaspidium Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in KC contra wrongly 1928 in NN. The cover of the fascicule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here as issue date.

P. 123: Gonyleptes scaber Kirby is wrongly dated as of 1818 in KC contra correctly 1819. This paper must be dated as of 2 July 1819, according to Raphael (1970).

P. 123–4: Friburgoia Mello-Leitão is wrongly dated as of 1931 in KC contra correctly 1932. The correct date for the publication where this appeared is 31 December 1932 (not 1931), the only date appearing in the volume being 1932 (which has been correctly assumed for the type species). This modifies the nomenclature proposed by KC as follows:

Schenkelibunus Strand, 1932: 138 [3 September 1932]
   = Hanseniella Mello-Leitão, 1927b: 18 [non Bagnall, 1913, Sympyila]
   = Friburgoia Mello-Leitão, 1932: 72. syn. nov. [31 December 1932]
   = Ziltaia Mello-Leitão, 1936b: 27

and the included species are: Schenkelibunus impar (Mello-Leitão, 1932) and Schenkelibunus perditus (Mello-Leitão, 1927), both comb. nov. There is no such thing in the Code as a “combination by implication”, as mentioned by the author, although there is no need to place the new genus in front of the combined species, just the mention that the species belongs to the combining genus.

P. 124: Geraecormobiella Mello-Leitão 1931 is wrongly spelled Geraecomorbiella in KC. According to NN, the correct spelling is Geraecormobiella. Geraecormobiella is consistently cited on pages 127, 128, 145 in Mello-Leitão. Geraecomorbiella in KC is a subsequent incorrect spelling.

P. 127: Gonyleptes curvicornis Mello-Leitão, 1932 is a secondary homonym of Weyhia curvicornis Roewer, 1913 (now in synonymy of G. horridus, p. 128) and must be replaced. Names in synonymy are also combinations with the genus where they are included and compete for homonymy. Consequently we create Gonyleptes melloleitaoi Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga nom. nov. as a replacement name for Mello-Leitão’s name.

P. 127: This is a misprinting: G. espiritosantensis should be formatted as a species heading in bold and italics.

P. 130: Gonyleptilus Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in KC contra wrongly 1928 in NN. The cover of the fascicule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here as issue date.

P. 134: Multumbo Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in KC contra wrongly 1928 in NN. The cover of the fascicule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here as issue date.

P. 134: Bunoweyhia Mello-Leitão, 1935 (currently under the synonymy of Neosadocus Mello-Leitão, 1926) is unavailable because it had no original type species designation (Art. 13.3). Validation of a name in synonymy after 1960 (even if a type species is invalidly designated) is also invalid (Art. 11.6.3).

P. 136: This is a misprinting causing confusion: Piaassagera Roewer, 1928 should be in larger type and bold, with the genus name in italics; otherwise it seems to be a synonym of Parapachylibunus, which, being a nomen nudum, should have been set in a different way (v.g. between brackets).
P. 137: *Leptogonys* Mello-Leitão is correctly dated as of [December] 1931 in *KC contra* wrongly 1932 in *NN*.

P. 137, right column, lines 9–10 from bottom (“remarks” in *Sphaerobunus* Roewer, 1917): There is no page priority recognised in the Code. The “present designation” is a choice of the First Reviser.


P. 143: The epithet *angulispinosis* is a faulty Latin construct, either deliberate or inadvertent. Unless it can be demonstrated that it is a mistyping or lapsus for *angulispinosa* (in combination with *Piresa*) originally (Art. 32.5.), it must be taken as a substantive in apposition, thence invariable (Art. 31.2.2, 31.2.3, 32.3). Consequently, *Mangaratiba angulispinosis* (H. Soares, 1966).

P. 143: Following data should be added after *Thaumatoletes rugosus* Roewer, 1930:

**RECORD. BRAZIL. Fernando de Noronha Island (Mendes & Kury, 2003): 152, figs 1–11 (redescription).**

P. 146: *Discocyrtoides* Mello-Leitão, 1923, according to *NN* (vol. 2, 1939: 121) is an incorrect original spelling for *Dyscocyrtoides*. Both spellings are present in the original paper, so, the second is valid because Neave acted as first reviser.

P. 149: *Dolichoscelis* Hope is wrongly dated as of 1837 in *KC contra* correctly 1836 in *NN*. Correct publication date of *Dolichoscelis* is between 21 June and 9 July 1836 although nominal date is 1837 (Raphael 1970).

P. 151: *Batomites* Mello-Leitão 1931 is unavailable because it had no original type species designation.

P. 152: This is a setting problem: *Ruschia vellutina* should be in bold type.

P. 153: The spelling *Acanthpachylus* Roewer is the only original spelling and should stand, but Roewer (1923) placed it in the synonymy of the genus *Acanthopachylus* and this spelling, which is an unjustified emendation (Art. 33.2.1), is in predominant use and according to Art. 33.2.3.1 it must stand, keeping its original author and date.

P. 154: *Gony leptes aculeatus* Kirby is wrongly dated as of 1818 in *KC contra* correctly 1819. This paper must be dated as of 2 July 1819, according to Raphael (1970).

P. 155: The heading for genus *Acrographinotus* has wrong author and date. It should be Holmgren, 1916, as in the synonymic list. *Acrographinotus* Holmgren is not a *nomen nudum*, since it had a description, although no species was mentioned. The type species is correctly cited.

P. 155: *Cstatoproceros* Soares & Bauab-Vianna is wrongly dated as of 1972 in *KC contra* correctly 1973 in *NN*. Volume 29 of *Acta Zoologica Lilloana* was published, according to its colophon, on 31-V-1973.


Remarks. Genera ending in –*ceras* (from Greek *keras*, “horn”) are neuter.


Remarks. Genera ending in –*soma* (from Greek soma, “body”) are neuter.

P. 157: *Bunoplus* Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in *KC contra* wrongly 1928 in *NN*. The cover of the fasci-cule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here.

P. 157: *Caldanatus* Roewer is correctly dated as of [15 July] 1943 in *KC contra* wrongly 1945 in *NN*. 
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P. 158: *Camposicolooides* B. Soares and *Capichabesia* B. Soares are correctly dated as of [12 December] 1944 in KC *contra* wrongly 1945 in NN.

P. 158: *Pseudoneogonyleptoides* B. Soares is correctly dated as of [12 December] 1944 in KC *contra* wrongly 1945 in NN.

P. 159: *Chausesia* B. Soares is correctly dated as of [12 December] 1944 in KC *contra* wrongly 1945 in NN.

P. 159: *Discocyrtulus* Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in KC *contra* wrongly 1928 in NN. The cover of the fascicule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here as issue date.

P. 160: *Discocyrtulusoma* Piza 1943 appears wrongly spelled as *Discocyrtulosoma* in KC. The synonym should be added:


P. 161. *Discocyrtus confusus* Kury, 2003 is unavailable. Replacement names can only be proposed for available names (Art. 13.1.3) which are invalid for any reason (usually homonymy), and *Gonyleptes curvipes* sensu Roewer, 1913 is a misidentification, that is, an unavailable name. This species is here re-described as a new species:

*Discocyrtus confusus* Kury, sp. nov.


Description: Ocularium very narrow with a pair of small parallel spines mostly fused together. Scutal areas III–IV entirely fused. Area IV with a pair of small paramedian acuminate tubercles. Prolateral-apical apophysis of coxa IV short, reaching middle of adjacent trochanter. Trochanter IV of male short, with 1 dorsal and 2 dorso-retrolateral spiniform apophyses. Femur IV of male sigmoid, with 2 dorso-medial and a row of 8 retrolateral robust spiniform apophyses, plus a pair of stout apical spurs. Patella and tibia IV of male unarmed. Etymology: the specific epithet is a Latin adjective of evident sense, based in the confuse nomenclatural and taxonomical history of this species.

Synonymy: *Gonyleptes curvipes* sensu Roewer, 1913: 231, fig 96 [misidentification]

*Discocyrtus confusus* Kury, 2003: 161 [unavailable name, proposed as a replacement name for *Gonyleptes curvipes* sensu Roewer, another unavailable name].

P. 162: *Pachyloides fischeri* Müller and *Pachyloides tuberculatus* Müller are wrongly dated as of 1918 in KC *contra* correctly 1917.

P. 167: *Eugyndes* Roewer is correctly dated as of 1923 in KC *contra* wrongly 1913 in NN.

P. 167: *Pucrolioides* Roewer is wrongly cited as the correct spelling in KC *contra* correctly *Pucroloides* in NN. *Pucrolioides* is spelled as *Pucroloides* in NN, as if it were original from Roewer, Neave cites however page 27. Roewer (1913) has both spellings: *Pucroloides* in a key to genera (page 10) and *Pucrolioides* in the description and figure caption (pages 27–28). Roewer (1923: 403) acted as first reviser and fixed the name *Pucroloides*.

P. 170: *Goodnightiella* Soares & Soares is correctly dated as of [5 July] 1945 in KC *contra* wrongly 1946 in NN.

P. 171: *Vitiches* Roewer is correctly dated as of 1927 in KC *contra* wrongly 1928 in NN. The cover of the fascicule bears 30-XII-1927 which is accepted here.

P. 171: The genus name is wrongly spelled *Wygodzinska*, while the type species is correctly written using *Wygodzinska* Soares & Soares.

P. 173: *Iandumoema* is wrongly dated as of 1996 in KC *contra* correctly 1997 in ZR. Correct publication date of *Iandumoema* is 18 July 1997 although nominal date is 1996.
P. 173: Ibarra Roewer is correctly dated as of 1925 in KC contra wrongly 1926 in NN. Publication date is 1 October 1925, although nominal date is 1926.

P. 174: The following species and records should be added before Lacronia serripes (Mello-Leitão):

Lacronia camboriu Kury, 2003
Lacronia camboriu Kury, 2003b: 33, figs 15–28 (types MNRJ 4956, ♂ holotype, 1 ♂ paratype; MNRJ 5990, 2 ♀ 6 ♀ paratypes).

TYPE LOCALITY. BRAZIL. SANTA CATARINA. Balneário Camboriú, Praia da Laranjeira.

RECORD. BRAZIL. SANTA CATARINA. Itajaí, slope of hill close to the sea, in bromeliads (Kury, 2003).

Lacronia ricardoi Kury, 2003
Lacronia ricardoi Kury, 2003b: 31, figs 1–14 (types MZSP 21373, ♂ holotype, 1 ♀ 1 juv. paratypes; MZSP 10589, 1 ♀ paratype).

TYPE LOCALITY. BRAZIL. SÃO PAULO. Peruíbe, in bromeliads.

Lacronia serripes (Mello-Leitão, 1923)

RECORD. BRAZIL. SÃO PAULO. Salesópolis, Boracéa (Kury, 2003b).

P. 180: Pachyloidellus Müller is wrongly dated as of 1918 in KC contra correctly 1917. The right date of Müller is 1917. Also Pachyloidellus fuscus (p. 181).

P. 185: Apophysigerus Canals is correctly dated as of 1935 in KC contra wrongly 1934 in NN. Issue date of the privately published Canals' paper is 18 September 1935.

P. 187: Passosa Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Correct publication date of Passosa is February 1928 although nominal date is 1927.

P. 188: Pseudogyndes Mello-Leitão, 1932, as well as all genera ending in –gyndes, are masculine, being Gyndes originally a masculine name for a river in Mesopotamia. Consequently, P. marginatus Roewer.

P. 189: Panagraphinotus Soares & Bauab-Vianna is wrongly dated as of 1972 in KC contra correctly 1973 in NN.

P. 189: Add to Canestrinia after Berlese, 1881 also “nec Mégnin & Trouessart, 1884, Arachnida”.

P. 189: Melloinia Thor is correctly used as the right spelling in KC. NN uses as valid the spelling Melloinio Thor, 1933. Only the spelling Melloinia with “a” appears consistently 3 times in Thor’s paper. Melloinio with “o” is a misspelling in NN. So, add to Melloinia as a synonym: Melloinio Neave, 1940, vol. 3: 97 [incorrect subsequent spelling].

P. 189: Pygophalangodus canalsi Mello-Leitão is wrongly dated in the heading as of 1930 but correctly in the reference as 1931. Correct publication date of Mello-Leitão (1931a) is 30 June 1931 not 1930. Moreover, in KC it is said that the combination Mello-Leitãoella canalsi is made by Strand “by implication”. This concept is absent from the Code, and combinations must be made by putting in paper the name of a genus and the name of a species together, or by saying that species A belongs to genus B. No “supposed” or “implicit” combinations are recognised, even when a new generic replacement name is proposed (Art. 48).

P. 190: Oxyrhyna is wrongly spelled in KC (incorrect subsequent spelling) contra correctly Oxyrhina, as in NN. The correct original spelling by B. Soares (1944) is Oxyrhina. Oxyrhina is a junior homonym of Oxyrhina Agassiz, 1835, Pisces.
P. 193: *Tarmapachylus* Roewer, 1956 is correctly spelled in KC contra wrongly in NN as *Tarmopachylus*. The original has been checked for alternative spellings and only *Tarmapachylus* is present.

P. 193: Authorship of *Tingomaria* is correctly attributed to Mello-Leitão in KC contra wrongly as having two authors: Mello-Leitão & A. Feio in NN. The paper in question is authored by Mello-Leitão & A. Feio, but it is explicitly stated in the text that Mello-Leitão alone did the part of Opiliones. *Tingomaria* is wrongly dated as of 1948 in KC contra correctly 1949 in NN. The nominal date of the paper is 1948, but issued only in 1949.

P. 197: *Leptocnemus* Koch, [July] 1839 is wrongly listed in KC as preoccupied by *Leptocnemus* Dejean, 1834 and to be replaced by *Leptocnema* Koch, [Dec.] 1839. But *Leptocnemus* Dejean is a nomen nudum (checked). Consequently, there is no homonymy and *Leptocnemus* Koch, 1839 should stand, as it has precedence over *Leptocnema* by a few months.

P. 198: *Progonyleptoidellus* Piza, 1940 is correctly spelled in KC contra wrongly in NN as *Progonyleptio* dellus. The original has been checked for alternative original spellings – it has no summary nor table of contents nor key, so the name, derived from *Progonyleptoides*, is written with -oi- twice on page 63, and once in the legend facing plate 2.

P. 199: *Stignobates* Mello-Leitão 1926 is wrongly tagged in KC as a nomen nudum with the definitive description *Stignobates* Mello-Leitão 1927 as the valid description and spelling. *Stignobates* appeared in a key (Mello-Leitão 1926: 358) and it is available, even if there were no species included (Art.12.1), because the key is a description. Mello-Leitão gave as type species *Stignobates* [sic!] *barbiellinii* by subsequent designation in 1927, and this is enough. NN wrongly considers both names as different descriptions, which is wrong.

The spelling *Stignobates* has been used only in the original description in 1926. Since 1927, the spelling *Stygno* bates, although being an incorrect subsequent spelling (Art. 33.3), has been consistently used in all works known to us dealing with this genus. In application of Art. 33.3.1, we deem that the correct name for the genus is *Stignobates* Mello-Leitão, 1926 (type species, *S. barbiellinii* Mello-Leitão, 1927 subsequent designation).

P. 200: The name Olynthoidae Sørensen, 1932 is permanently invalid, because its type genus is a homonym (Art. 39).

P. 201: *Bissulla* Roewer, 1929 is correctly spelled in KC contra *Bissula* in NN. *Bissulla* with –ll- appears once in the key (page 182), 3 times in the description and figure caption (page 214) and once in the alphabetic index (page 283). In the original description there is no spelling of *Bissula* with –l-, this being Neave’s subsequent misspelling (to be added to the synonymy).


Remarks. Genera ending in –stigma (from Greek *stigma*, “mark” or “spot”) are neuter.


P. 203: The authorship of *Poecilosophus* is correctly attributed to Mello-Leitão in KC contra wrongly as having two authors: Mello-Leitão & A. Feio in NN. The names of Opiliones in that joint work by Mello-Leitão & Feio are authored only by Mello-Leitão. *Poecilosophus* is wrongly dated as of 1948 in KC contra correctly 1949 in NN. In KC, *Poecilosophus* Mello-Leitão in Mello-Leitão & Feio has priority over *Soaresula* Roewer. The date of publication of Mello-Leitão & Feio is not known with certainty, the nominal date being 1948, and we adopt that of the entry of the volume in the library of the Museu Paraense “Emilio Goeldi” (4th July 1949, F.J. Cavalcante, *pers.comm.*) in agreement with the provisions of Art. 21.7. Roewer (1949b) was nominally issued in July 1949 and the application of the provisions of Art. 21.3.1 obliges us to date it as of 31st July. The precedence is thus kept as in KC, but with more accurate dates.
P. 203: Monticola B. Soares, 1944: Add as well “nec Nalivkin, 1930, Brachiopoda”.

P. 204: Olynthus Sørensen, 1932: NN gives “Hübner, 1819”, as well as recent authors. Add also: “nec Haeckel, 1869, Spongiaria”.

P. 205: Strangely, NN gives, besides the replacement name Tachusina by Strand, 1942, a replacement name Tuchusina in the same paper. It is Neave’s mistake, Strand 1942 paper has only Tachusina.

P. 207: Belemnodes correctly appears in KC as a valid replacement name for Belemnus. But, as the problem is complex, it is discussed here: Fischer de Waldheim (1817: 450) considered that –ites is an ending exclusive of fossils, so, having discovered alleged recent species of Belemnites would be sufficient motive to change Belemnites to Belemnus. Belemnus Fischer de Waldheim, 1817 could be interpreted as an incorrect subsequent spelling (a lapsus) for Belemnites, and, consequently, would have no status in nomenclature, and could not compete with Belemnus Roewer, 1932. However, Belemnus Fischer is an unjustified emendation, which acquires author and date and is available (cites and replaces Belemnites). Fischer’s name could be otherwise construed as a ‘regular’ new genus name, established in combination with a name for a living species; anyway, in this case too the implication for Roewer’s name would be the same. This implies that Belemnus Roewer is a junior homonym and must be replaced by the first synonym available. So, Belemnodes Strand, 1942 is a valid replacement name for Belemnus.

P. 207: Cranellus Roewer, 1932 (non Cranellus Tobias, 1844, Aves [checked]). This name is a homonym and must be replaced. We propose the following replacement:

Narcellus Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga, nom. nov. Type species: Cranellus balthazar Roewer, 1932. Etymology: anagram of Cranellus. Gender masculine. Description: same as that of Cranellus in Roewer, 1932: 310; (Art. 13.1.2). Accordingly, the following new combinations are made: Narcellus balthazar (Roewer, 1932) comb. nov. and Narcellus montgomeryi (Goodnight & Goodnight, 1947) comb. nov.

P. 211: Euminua Sørensen, 1932 is unavailable, because it was described without a type species designation. Authors who treated the genus later failed to give a type species, as requested by the Code. Designation of a type species in KC does not make available the genus with Kury, 2003 as author and date because he failed to fulfil the requirements of Art. 16.1. This genus is here described as new:


P. 211: Euminuoides longitarsa (Sørensen, 1932): This combination must be taken from Mello-Leitão (1935b: 92), when citing the type species (it is enough to include a species in a genus, there is no need to write the combination as it should be). The spelling longitarsis is an incorrect subsequent spelling.

P. 211: Fudeci González-Sponga is wrongly dated as of 1997 in KC contra correctly 1998 in Zoological Record. Publication date is October 1998.

P. 212: Metakimula botosaneanui (Avram, 1973) is a new combination in KC and lacks the parentheses around author and date.

P. 212: Minua Sørensen, 1932 is unavailable, because it was described without a type species designation. Authors who treated the genus later failed to give a type species, as requested by the Code. Designation of a type species in KC does not make available the genus with Kury, 2003 as author and date because he failed to fulfil the requirements of Art. 16.1. Being the name of a king, if available, it would be masculine in gender, not feminine as treated in KC and originally by its author. This genus must be replaced with its available synonym Minuella Roewer, 1949, which is feminine. Consequently the species must be named: Minuella barloventensis González-Sponga, 1987, M. crassa González-Sponga, 1987, M. choroniensis González-Sponga, 1987, M. denticulata González-Sponga, 1987, M. dimorpha (Sørensen, 1932), M. elias (Sørensen, 1932), M. guatopenis González-Sponga, 1987, M. momoyana...

In this case, the family name Minuidae is also unavailable, being based on an unavailable genus. Consequently, the next available synonym would have to be used: Minuididae Mello-Leitão, 1933 (type genus: *Minuides* Sørensen, 1932). But Pérez- González & Kury (2007) excluded *Minuides* from this family and a new family name, Kimulidae Pérez-González, Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga 2007, had to be created.


P. 219: *Acanthocheir* Lucas is wrongly dated as of 1860 in KC contra correctly 1861. Part 4 of the 8th volume of 3rd series of the *Annales de la Société entomologique de France* can be dated from its reception in the Bulletin of Séances as of 15 May 1861.

P. 220: *Metapachylus* Banks, 1909: This supposed genus simply does not exist. There is a description of *Metapachylus rugosus* as a new species, now *Pachylicus rugosus* (see KC, p. 248) in the pre-existing genus *Metapachylus* Pickard-Cambridge, 1905 (which is a junior homonym of a beetle name, see below). No new heading for this “new” genus is found, as it was customary in Banks’s papers, so this mention is to be cancelled. The mistake is to be attributed to Goodnight & Goodnight, 1942, who considered it valid by synonymizing it under *Sitalcina* Banks, 1911. It seems that they intended to indicate that the *Metapachylus* species of Banks should not be included in *Metapachylus* proper and just forgot to add “(part)”.

P. 222: Podocitia Roewer, 1912: The original reference is lacking. It should be there even if described from outside the Americas:

Phalangodidae Podocitinae Roewer, 1912a: 201.

P. 225: *Zmotus* Sørensen, 1932 is not an available name, having been treated as a manuscript name intended to be a new generic name when Sørensen was alive, but used by the editor of his posthumous work as a synonym of *Eu-"".
ment name Stenopharellus. Thence, we consider that a correction to the Remarks should be done: “senior” instead of “junior”. Also the statement “(non Stenophareus Roewer, 1943)” should be deleted.

P. 234: Stygnomma Roewer is correctly dated as of 1912 in KC contra wrongly 1914 in NN. Preprint date of Roewer (1912b) is 1912, based on Crawford (1992) and Cokendolpher (pers. comm.). Preprint should be mentioned in references as such, as it is a different publication (Art. 21.8).

P. 234: Stygnommatiplus Roewer is wrongly dated as of 1927 in KC contra correctly 1928 in NN. Nominal date of the paper is 1927. Issued February 1928.

P. 235: Stygnomma is correctly treated in KC as neuter, but Goodnight & Goodnight’s granulosa original spelling is incorrectly kept. This word being a Latin adjective, it must be in gender agreement. Consequently: S. granulosum.


Remarks. Genera ending in –ceras: this is Greek for “horn” and is neuter (see examples of Art. 30.1.2 of ICZN).

P. 242: Curimagua González-Sponga: the following could also be added: “nec Hoffmann, 1982, Diplopoda”.

P. 242: Malea Sørensen, 1932 is an unavailable name and, moreover, a homonym of Malea Valenciennes, 1832 (Mollusca).


Remarks. Names ending in –omma (eye) are neuter.

P. 245: Granulaia González-Sponga is wrongly dated as of 1997 in KC contra correctly 1998 in Zoological Record. Publication date is October 1998.

P. 246: Junquito denticuloso González-Sponga, 1999: The specific epithet cannot be corrected under the Code (Art. 31.2.3), since it is a pseudo-Latin rendering of a vernacular Spanish adjective.

P. 246: Metapachylus Pickard-Cambridge, 1905 (non Bates, 1889, Coleoptera). This name is a homonym and must be replaced. We propose here Pyropharynx Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga nom. nov. (from Greek pýr, fire, and phár-ynx, throat) after the effects of the sauce named Tabasco, from the region where the type species was collected. Gender feminine (it should be noted that the Greek word phárynx also has a rarer masculine form). Consequently, Pyropharynx gracilis (Pickard-Cambridge, 1905), comb. nov.

P. 247: Ovalia González-Sponga, 1987 (non Latreille in Griffith & Pidgeon, 1833, Crustacea; nec Nalivkin, 1937, Brachiopoda). This name is a junior homonym and must be replaced. We replace it with Oo Kury & Alonso-Zarazaga nom. nov., name inspired in the original one, which makes reference to an egg-shaped outline (in Greek, egg is Ὠο), and with neuter gender. With González-Sponga’s permission (pers. comm., 2004). Consequently, Oo spinosum (González-Sponga, 1999), comb. nov.

P. 247: Neave gives Pachylicus, also present in Canestrini (1894) as an alternative original spelling for Pachylichus Canestrini, 1894 (Acari), which could have precedence over Roewer (1923). Only the spelling with –chus is the correct, so the other with –cus is an incorrect original spelling and does not affect Roewer’s name. We could find neither cited as valid in the ZR. A literature search revealed many instances of the use of Pachylichus as valid mite genus in Pyroglyphidae.

P. 247: The species named Pachylicus floresius (Goodnight & Goodnight, 1947) must be named P. petrunkevitchi (Mello-Leitão, 1942) by priority.
P. 248: *Panoplia* Roewer, 1949: It is “non Hübnner, 1825, nec Heyden, 1826”.

P. 250: This is a misprint: In the synonymy of genus *Pilosa* González-Sponga, instead of *Pilosa*, it is said *Junquito*.

P. 250: *Retropedis* González-Sponga: This is another case with doubts about gender (masculine or feminine? It cannot be neuter). The last part, *-pedis* is latin for “louse” and is masculine, but it seems that he meant the also masculine substantive (considering a bad latinization) *-pes* “foot” or “leg” (*-pedis* should be its genitive, and then the name would hardly meet the requirements of Art. 11.8). It is considered here a pseudo-Latin misconstruct of masculine gender, either by using Art. 30.1.1 or Art. 30.1.4.5, since the gender is not indicated by the combination with a feminine substantive in apposition (*magnapatella*).

P. 251: *Chersobleptes* Sørensen, 1932 is unavailable, lacking an original type species designation. Authors who treated the genus later failed to give a type species, as requested by the Code. Designation of a type species in KC does not make available the genus with Kury, 2003 as author and date because he failed to fulfil the requirements of Art. 16.1 and the genus is kept in synonymy.


P. 274: *Thaumatopachylus setulosus* Roewer, 1929 is wrongly cited as the not-proposed combination *Neopachyloides setulosus* (Roewer, 1929).

P. 285: *Sibollus margaritatus* Roewer, 1929 is wrongly cited as the not-proposed combination *Neopachyloides margaritatus* (Roewer, 1929).
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